

Interview Summary	Application N .		Applicant(s)	
	09/886,589		GENTILE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Christopher C Pratt		1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher C Pratt.

(3) James Tanner.

(2) Tom Connelly.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 6/9/03.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Video tape of the instant invention responding to various fluids.

Claim(s) discussed: All generally.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5998030.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: ____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,589	GENTILE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher C Pratt	1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher C Pratt.

(3) James Tanner.

(2) Tom Connelly.

(4) Chayl Tusha

Date of Interview: 6/9/03.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Video tape of the instant invention responding to various fluids.

Claim(s) discussed: All generally.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5998030.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant argued that the instant invention could be distinguished from Hensen in 3 ways. ① Hensen fails to teach fiber to fiber hydrogen bonds. ② Hensen compresses below 5 and the skilled artisan would not be motivated to further compact. ③ The instant invention has a diff. functionality b/c it absorbs water not blood. There is a diff. b/c water allows for breakage of hydrogen bonds and expansion. The examiner indicated that increasing the compression factor to 20 would provide the best chance of overcoming Hensen.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required